

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 2-16 and 18-21 are pending in the present applications. Claims 1-9 and 14-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,920,692 (Nguyen et al.). Additionally, claims 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen et al. in view of Official Notice. Also, claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,780 (Licato).

With respect to claims 9 and 18, the Office Action did not find the previous arguments persuasive because "Nguyen disclosed registration of listeners with an event name service, where the registration of listeners existed independent of whether an event source was connected (i.e. 'on line') or not (see col. 3, lines 7-25; Fig. 2)." Accordingly, the Office Action concluded that "the broad concept of the event name service acting as a proxy was taught by Nguyen, as it was disclosed that the event named service used 'notifiers' for connecting the listeners before the event source was on-line (see col. 3, lines 7-35; Fig. 2)."

However, the Office Action misinterpreted the cited sections of Nguyen et al. as teaching that which is called for in claims 9 and 18. The distinctions can be most readily appreciated by comparing Fig. 1 of the present application to Figs. 2 and 3 of Nguyen et al. Specifically, for example, claim 9 calls for a system where a listener may register with an event name server to receive an event from a particular event source that is not yet on-line and the event name service acts as a proxy for that event source until that event source finally becomes on-line. That is, claims 9 and 18 call for the specific functionality described on page 7, lines 5-10 of the present application whereby an event name service 30 may act as a surrogate for specific event sources that are not yet on-line.

On the other hand, the cited sections of Nguyen et al. merely state that a listener may register or unregister with the notification directory and a notifier will manage a list of listeners that have been registered with the notification director. In this regard, when a server wishes to communicate an event, as shown in Fig. 3, it

does so by communicating the event to a notifier that can then translate the event to a listener listed as available in the list maintained by the notifier utilizing the notification director. This disclosure does not teach or suggest that any event name service is capable of acting as a proxy or surrogate for event generators that have are not yet online.

For at least these reasons, claims 9 and 18 are patentably distinct from the art of record. Furthermore, claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10-13, and 19 are in condition for allowance at least pursuant to the chain of dependency.

Nevertheless, with respect to claim 13, Applicant believes that the Office Action incorrectly concluded that such was obvious merely because Licato discloses some common medical imaging devices. Rather, Licato provides no teaching or suggestion why one of ordinary skill in the art would take the teachings of Nguyen et al. and attempt to extend such across medical imaging environments. Applicant asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art looking to communicate even information across a distributed medical imaging system including one of an MRI medical imaging system, a CT system, a PET medical imaging system, an x-ray scanner and a nuclear imaging scanner would not be inclined by the teachings of Licato to look to Nguyen et al., which is directed to simple multi-user applications such as chat programs and adventure games, for guidance. For at least these reasons, claim 13 is additionally distinguishable from the art of record.

Referring now to claim 6, the Office Action disagrees with the general contention that Nguyen et al. does not teach or suggest filtering. While Applicant does not disagree that Nguyen et al may interpreted in a general sense to teach filtering in that, upon receiving an event from the event server, a notifier only sends notice of that event to listeners that have previously registered with the notifier, this "filtering" does not teach or suggest that which is called for in claim 6.

Specifically, claim 6 calls for a filtering system whereby an event source determines whether to provide notification of an event to a particular listener "based upon a filter determined by the event name service in response to the registering at least some of the first event listener and the additional event listeners at the event

name service." However, Nguyen et al. teaches that the notifier, rather than an event name service, maintain the list that determines whether the notifier will send an even notice to a listener. Specifically, Nguyen et al. states, "When a Listener 202 registers with the Notification Directory 200, it is added to the list maintained by the Notifier 204 for the associated Listener type." Col. 3, ll. 22-25.

Nevertheless, Applicant has amended claim 6 to clarify the claimed invention. Specifically, Applicant has amended the claim to clarify that the event name service acts as a surrogate for event sources that are currently offline. As discussed above with respect to claim 9, the art of record does not teach or suggest such a system.

For at least these reasons, claim 6 is patentability distinct from the art of record. Accordingly, claim 21 is in condition for allowance at least pursuant to the chain of dependency.

With respect to claims 14 and 20, the Office Action asserted that the claimed filtering system employing "combinations of events" is taught by the above discussed system of Nguyen et al., whereby notifiers only send a notification of events to listeners that have previously registered with that notifier. However, as shown above with respect to claim 6, Nguyen et al. does not teach or suggest the claimed filtering system. Furthermore, Nguyen et al. does not teach or suggest the claimed filtering of *combinations of events* in the manner claimed. Rather, it appears the Office Action merely concluded that since the system of Nguyen et al. is not limited to one event and one event only, it, therefore, filters combinations of events. First, Applicant believes this is an overly broad meaning of "combination of events," as claimed. Second, this overly broad meaning does not fit within the context of the claim, which calls for specific steps for filtering "combinations of events."

Nevertheless, Applicant has amended claims 14 and 20 to clarify the invention. In this regard, Applicant has amended the claims to clarify that the event sources that are currently offline are provided with a proxy so that event listeners

can register while the event sources are currently offline. As discussed above with respect to claims 9 and 6, the art of record does not teach or suggest such a system.

For at least these reasons, claims 14 and 20 are patentably distinct from the art of record. Furthermore, claims 15 and 16 are in condition for allowance at least pursuant to the chain of dependency.

For at least these reasons, Applicant believes the present application is now in condition for allowance and Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. However, should the Examiner disagree, as always, the Examiner if invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below if such would advance the prosecution of this application. The Examiner is hereby authorized to deduct the fee for a one month extension of time for a large entity along with any additional fees arising as a result of this amendment or any other communication, from Deposit Account 17-0055.

Respectfully submitted,

Phani Kumar Bidarahalli et al.

By:



Jack M. Cook, Reg. No. 56,098
Attorney for Applicant
Quarles & Brady LLP
411 E. Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee WI 53202-4497
(414) 277-5719